

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 24, 2004 LR 209

other people on their side. It's a political move, and they'd put anything in that part to get what they want. If that part is too difficult to understand or explain, each word would have to be presented for the purpose of getting a judicial determination, and that is done through litigation. When Senator Landis talks about a lawyer's dodge, he hasn't read the language that he put here. He needs to read it, he needs to understand. And sometimes when we have notes brought to us, we ought to use our own judgment in making a determination as to how they apply. But if he really believes what he said, that those words, "assembly," when you're talking about the right to peaceably assemble, is not defined and is not understood, oh, it's defined in plenty of places and in plenty of cases. And often what a court says language means trumps the language itself. The interpretation that the court gives to language determines what that language means. And that started with Justice John Marshall, as Senator Landis should remember if he jogs his remembrance. And that's why the U.S. Supreme Court can annul acts of Congress. There's nothing in the constitution that gives the U.S. Supreme Court that power. It was arrogated by the court to itself, and it has been accepted, and it continues in an unbroken line from that date to this. So to try to take all of that body of law and say that words that have been defined over and over and over are no clearer in meaning than this that he has given us is to show that he does not understand the history of the constitution, the language therein, or how constitutional provisions are given meaning by the courts. Now, the Legislature can abolish, it can repeal the trust act,...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the Environmental Trust Act. And if that's what creates the Nebraska Environmental Trust Fund, it would automatically go away too. I don't even know what is meant in line 10 by "related transfers." Related transfers from whom? Just the lottery fund? Those wouldn't be related. That is the transfer. If they're talking about related transfers meaning from some other source, what are those sources? Maybe I don't understand what is presented here just from reading it. This is not good constitutional language. Constitutional